

Remarks

Claims 5-7, 10 and 12-33 are pending in this application. Claims 7, 26 and 30 have been amended in various particulars as indicated hereinabove.

Counsel for the Applicants note with appreciation the interview held with the Examiner on December 5, 2007.

Interview summary: In the December 5th interview, held with the undersigned and Steven Blumenthal, the background technology and claim scope of exemplary claims 7 and 26 were discussed. The relationship of these claims to the Oda patent was also discussed.

Claims 26 and 30 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 26 and 30 have been amended to overcome the informalities.

Claims 5, 6, 7, 10, and 25-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Oda *et al.* (US 7,177,636 B2). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons. In related rejections, claims 12-13 and 27-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oda *et al.* (U.S. 7,177,636 B2) in view of Pan *et al.* (US 2004/0002335 A1); claims 14-16, 20-22 and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oda *et al.* (U.S. 7,177,636 B2) in view of Bridgelall (US 2002/0085516 A1); and claims 17-19, 23-24 and 32-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oda *et al.* (U.S. 7,177,636 B2) in view of Bridgelall (US 2002/0085516 A1) and Pan *et al.* (U.S. 2004/0002335 A1).

These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

As noted in the interview, independent claim 7 includes a number of features not found in the Oda patent as reviewed in the interview.

For example, claim 7 requires calls from the cellular carrier network being received via a fixed radio terminal of the controller, with the controller routing the calls

received from the cellular carrier network to the mobile terminal over the wireless local area network. In contrast, the system in the Oda patent teaches that the gateway 130 and MSC/VLR 121 interface like a base station. Thus, calls are maintained over a wired system, not via a radio connection as claimed. Moreover, as further required by the claim, the controller maintains the calls over the cellular carrier network through the fixed radio terminal and over the wireless local area network to the mobile terminal.

As mentioned in the interview, a disadvantage of the claimed system is that calls are still maintained over the cellular network when the user is on the wireless LAN. The advantage, however is that no business relationship is required with any one cellular company. The use of the wireless LAN can be transparent to the cellular phone company since the controller can emulate the cellular phone on the cellular network.

Claim 26 is further distinguishable since it includes the feature of the mobile terminal inheriting call parameters of the controller and switching a radio to the cellular carrier network using the call parameters when the mobile terminal moves from the wireless local area network into the cellular carrier network. The inheriting of the call parameters from the controller to the mobile terminal is also not shown by the applied reference.

Each of the other independent claims has similar features.

Based on the consensus from the interview, it is agreed that these features are not shown in the primary reference nor would be obvious in view of the combinations.

Withdrawal of these rejections is requested.

Application No.: 10/688,608
Amendment dated: December 17, 2007
Reply to Office Action of June 19, 2007
Attorney Docket No.: 0012.0001US1

It is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. Should any questions arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

By /grant houston/
J. Grant Houston
Registration No.: 35,900
Tel.: 781 863 9991
Fax: 781 863 9931

Lexington, Massachusetts 02421
Date: December 17, 2007